# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

### Application #1402KY-1 for Fayette County Public Schools

## A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)** | 10 | 10 |

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Normally, it would be very difficult for 11 distinct school districts who vary considerably in size and demographics to collaborate on a project of this magnitude, however the applicant provides convincing evidence of their ability to coordinate implementation efforts so they are able to advance students' achievement in all 11 districts. One example of this evidence includes the description of the pre-existing relationship these districts have, collaborating within the Innovation Lab Network for the past two years. Further, the applicant identifies a set of 5 core principles each district will follow as they implement their own individual plan specific to the identified needs of their districts -- which reflects thoughtful consideration given to the potential difficulties in maintaining implementation fidelity in this large of a project. A solid rationale is provided for why Fayette County is the lead LEA (e.g. financial capacity, and houses a majority of the participating students). The applicant provides a great deal of specificity about how these districts' RTTT-D projects will be alike and different. The commonalities (e.g. the Dashboard, the 5 core principles, support from UK P-20 Lab) help provide a cohesive vision for implementation and improve opportunities to share best practices and disseminate information about successful models. Also, allowing the flexibility to shape their vision to fit their district will facilitate buy-in among their local stakeholders thereby increasing chances for project success.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)** | 10 | 9 |

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

It is very evident the applicant devoted significant effort to tailoring each district's implementation to their strengths, prior experience and communities. Granted, the 11 districts propose interventions that are, at times, very dissimilar. (i.e. from after school centers in Knox to World Languages in Kenton to earning college credit before graduation in Jessamine high school) However the approach specified in great detail in the appendices provides convincing evidence of their ability to facilitate high-quality implementation. Specifically, the districts who are ready to take on large implementation efforts and more significant changes (e.g. Fayette) are proposing to do so, and those smaller districts who may not have as much history with innovative reform (e.g. Graves) are proposing to start out with a manageable intervention to advance learning.

A few relatively minor inconsistencies include:

(1) Boone Co.'s approach specifies Science and Social Studies but table specifies "all subjects"

(2) Eminence's approach focuses on "revamping the high school" schedule w/out specifying a targeted subject area, yet table includes gr.K-4 as "participating students" and only includes 8th gr Math/Science and 9th gr Math/ELA as "participating students"

(3) Knox Co.'s approach specifies after school community centers available to all students who need help but "participating students" table only includes grades 4-12. There is no mention of their community centers being restricted to specific grade bands.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)** | 10 | 5 |

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

While the applicant does list specific activities used to scale up these reforms, the proposal lacks specificity regarding timelines, deliverables and responsible parties related to the proposed scale up. In some of the 11 districts, their approach is already districtwide and in others it is limited to specific schools, and the applicant does not address how the subset of districts who are not implementing this as a districtwide reform will scale up their approaches to eventually include others in their district. For example, the proposal states "*scaling up to impact all of the ILN districts and then extending influence to the*

*rest of the state*" but there is limited evidence about how this will be accomplished other than a description of various presentations at state meetings that will occur.

| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| --- | --- | --- |

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

A (4) –   The applicant does a thorough job of providing achievement targets for the 11 school districts participating in the consortium.  The applicant begins by stating they are moving away from their previous focus on "proficiency for all" yet several of the districts (e.g. Eminence, Williamstown, and Knox) do just that, indicate 100%proficiency by the end of the grant. In some places, it is a bit confusing because each district specifies different targets and while there is substantial overlap in measures, some of the tables aren't entirely clear.  There are also several inconsistencies for some of the districts. Overall, the proposal seems fragmented in this section, however it is understandable the applicant would want to allow flexibility for each district to select measures and targets specific to their circumstances and level of implementation (which do vary considerably across this consortium).  Some examples of inconsistencies include:

- Kenton doesn't provide any information for grad rates or college enrollment, yet about half of their participating students are in high school.
- Jessamine is missing some figures related to Mean RIT Math score so it is unclear what the targets are for this area.
- Barren Co. has very confusing formatting for their summative assessment table which provides little information on achievement targets, and no goals are presented for graduation rate increases even though their primary intervention is based on giving students access to a virtual high school.
- Eminence has very unrealistic goals given the scope of their proposal which focuses primarily on the middle/high school. For example, they propose a goal of increasing proficiency in their elementary Math from 16.8% to 100% and elementary Reading from 28% to 100% by the time the grant is over which does not seem realistic given their approach to implementation.
- Knox County shows a gap of 2 percentage points for $5^{th}$ gr Reading in the final year of the grant, yet a previous table indicates their students will be 100% proficient by the final year.  In addition, Knox County proposes the use of Lexile scores to measure project success however Lexile figures are reported on a vertical scale anyway so they will naturally increase as the student gets older which does not necessarily indicate growth beyond what would've occurred without implementation of this grant. Lastly, Knox County's portion of the project involves providing after-school learning activities two afternoons a week yet they are suggesting this, alone, will increase proficiency rates from~ 50% to 100% in $4^{th}$ and $5^{th}$ grades, for example.  This does not seem to be realistic.
- In Fayette County's table showing targeted decreases in achievement gaps, it is unclear whether the numbers reflect the # of percentage points difference in the % passing for each group, or the # of scale score points difference between the two groups.
- Williamstown's scope of this project is inconsistent with their targets. Specifically, their implementation mainly focuses on High School Math yet they are proposing an achievement target that basically doubles during this grant period for grades 3-8, and End of Course tests in English and Biology,  who are students/subjects that may be relatively unaffected by this project.  For example, it is not likely that "standards based grading...for elementary students" will yield gains this large.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

| | Available | Score |
| --- | --- | --- |
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 7 |

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

There seems to be wide variability in the extent to which these 11 LEA's can demonstrate a track record of success, and in some cases, the evidence they provide is contradictory.  For example, Barren mentions "tremendous academic gains" but this contradicts the charts they present of historical ACT/EXPL/PLAN scores and Boone provides a chart showing "gain projection" which is not the same as a "track record". Some examples of strong evidence of a track record include Fayette (# of Schools meeting benchmark increasing from 3 to 24) and Eminence (% of students College/Career Ready increasing from 39% in 2010 to 75% in 2012) and Jessamine (significant increases in PLAN scores for students using personal devices).  However, some of the other LEA's (e.g. Graves,Knox, Trigg)  simply describe what they're going to do or only describe current programs in place in their schools without any evidence of achievement gains or gaps closing, and this does not respond to the selection criteria which asks for their track record (e.g. recent history) of success.  There is very limited evidence of the LEA's currently making student performance data available in ways that inform and improve instruction (i.e. only Kenton provides solid

examples re: use of data by educators), however the applicant has stated a plan to address this during the early stages of implementation (e.g. Data Dashboard). Overall, most of the LEA's provide convincing evidence of success for selection criteria B(1)(b) but evidence is weaker and more variable across LEA's for B(1)(a) and B(1)(c).

| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

While the applicant does provide evidence that 3 of the 4 categories of school-level expenditures are available to the public, there are other irrelevant details in the proposal about publishing school "report cards" of achievement and their systems for accounting and budgeting practices. Further, it cites laws that have been in place for over two decades (regarding how poorer schools are funded and how meetings are open to the public) which doesn't necessarily demonstrate transparency in LEA practices and processes given there are 11 different LEA's in thei consortium. There is no evidence of transparancy in non-personnel expenditures at the school-level. Further, the only evidence of transparency in LEA processes and practices is the mention of compliance with Open Records and Open Meetings Laws (which is required of everyone), and the SBDM Council that includes parent/teacher reps and just about every school in the country has one of these 'advisory-type' councils. Overall, the information is available (as stated in the NIA) but there is limited evidence their constituents would know how or where to access it which is a key part of the "transparency".

| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Overall, the applicant provides convincing evidence of a state context that will allow for implementation of the learning environments proposed here. (e.g. the state 'data mart', the CIITS portal under development) The state DOE seems to encourage innovation (e.g. formation of ILN in 2010) and wants districts to find ways to meet the needs of their diverse groups of students throughout the state which will facilitate successful implementation of this proposal since there is significant variability in the approach needed for each of these 11 LEA's. One solid example of this state context is the District of Innovation Bill passed a few months ago, which allows the LEA's in this proposal to seek approval to "*be released from certain state statutes and regulations that...impede their efforts to move forward with high-quality reform initiatives*" though the applicant does not provide examples of which statues/regulations they'd be released from.

| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Because this proposal includes 11 different LEA's, naturally there is variability in the level of involvement from stakeholders in the development of this proposal. The applicant doesn't provide examples of the level of involvement from each of the LEA's though, rather, the proposal just acknowledges variaiblity in levels of involvement. Further, some implementation plans are on a smaller scale (Boone & Knox) and others on a larger scale (Eminence & Fayette) so this will also affect stakeholder engagement.(e.g. larger reforms like Fayette really need to demonstrate teacher involvement in the development of these ideas, whereas smaller reforms like Knox can easily garner support for their idea) There is no evidence of involvement by students or families. In the appendices, the applicant provides signature sheets from each LEA indicating support for this proposal, however it is unclear whether the teachers knew exactly what the plan entailed, or in essence what they were agreeing to. For example, many of the samples simply say they support the "pursuit" of RTTT funding and the narrative states in some LEA's, "planning primarily [was done] by central office staff and principals". This could hinder buy-in if teachers were "sold" on the idea of pursuing RTTT money without fully realizing how significantly it may change their school structure or instructional practice.

| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

In various places throughout the narrative, the applicant explains the implementation approach in each LEA and how it is intended to address identified needs and gaps but doesn't really specify how those gaps were identified. Further the applicant does not explicitly state a high-quality plan for an analysis of their current status in implemention personalized learning environments. Their approaches describe how they will provide this in the future but not their current status. In fact, section B(5) of the narrative only describes the development of the learning dashboard which is only going to occur if the project is funded.

# C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(C)(1) Learning (20 points)** | 20 | 16 |

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides convincing evidence of their ability to implement personalized learning environments that will accelerate student learning. In fact, many of their ideas are unique and ambitious and have the potential to significantly impact student progress.  Specifically, their Teacher Leadership Academy and their "3-tiered performance system" are ideas that can be implemented across the 11 LEA's and still fit with their individual approaches.  The plan also mentions giving students immediate feedback from teachers via "24-hour turn around feedback from teacher-made assessments" which is ambitious but a fantastic idea and high-quality strategy for students, particularly those who need support.  Having relatively immediate feedback will allow students maximum opportunity to improve their skills prior to the next assessment.  The inclusion of an e-portfolio for each student that stays with them across years will provide an excellent way to facilitate transitions from year to year and teacher to teacher. Too often, teachers spend the first month or two of a school year "getting to know" their students' skills and abilities and this approach could potentially streamline this process a great deal and make instruction more productive from the beginning of the school year.  The applicant also mentions some of the superintendents and principals "leading student focus groups". This is another strong example of personalized learning, giving students a much-needed voice about their school environment which is likely to increase student engagement.

There are a few places where the narrative is vague.  Specifically, a reference to analyzing "models developed...by Adams 50 District in Denver" and "Aspire Public Schools".  There is almost no detail provided other than saying these models include mastery-learning goals. It is unclear how the analysis of these models will impact this project's implementation goals.  Also, the use of "Individual Learning Plans" has been in place for 6th-12th students for "more than 10 years" so it is unclear how continued use of a somewhat dated practice will facilitate significant reform efforts in these LEA's.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)** | 20 | 7 |

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes some strategies that will facilitate the teaching and leading process but some contradictory statements exist in the narrative so it is unclear what LEA's will do to increase collective capacity of their teachers.  For example, the narrative states Teacher Academies will exist "for the purpose of exploring blended learning models" and in the following paragraph it says Teacher Academies are "designed around mastery learning, project-based learning and standards-based evaluation and reporting" and it is described as though these two ideas are mutually exclusive.   The proposal states educators will receive training in tools/resources to structure personalized learning in each Hotspot but never really specifies what those tools/resources are.  Further, the proposal mentions how every LEA will "deveop instructional units" however some of the approaches specified in the implementation plan involve only supplemental support (e.g. Knox) and not direct instruction so it is confusing what the purpose of instructional unit development would serve in an after-school program meeting two afternoons per week to support students' skills, or a program designed to allow students time to take college level courses.  The proposal does not contain convincing evidence the teachers in each of the LEA's will receive specific training for each of their unique implementation plans to facilitate the overall success of this initiative.  Overall, the involvement of UK  and KDE provides a bit of evidence the training will be of high-quality and focused on best practices, but there is so much diversity among these 11 LEA's plans, there needs to be far more specificity in how teachers and leaders will have the necessary skills and resources to make this project a collective success.

# D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)** | 15 | 9 |

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides thorough evidence of adequate governance. (e.g. SAC and district advisory councils). This demonstrates thoughtful consideration to potential barriers that will exist among a diverse group of LEA's. However, the applicant does not explicitly address selection criteria D(1)(d) and D(1)(e). Elsewhere in this proposal, the applicant specifies use of several measures, most of which are administered annually and this will not allow students to demonstrate mastery "at multiple times in multiple ways".

| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|---|---|

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

While there is some evidence of an infrastructure and process to support modification of existing practices that will facilitate implementation, there is limited evidence of the LEA's ability to provide access to resources both in and out of school. In a few cases, the core of the approach is providing assistance outside of the school day, but that's not true in all of the LEA's. For those whose approach focuses largely on in-school changes, evidence is not presented regarding how they will address access to resources out of school or have access to appropriate levels of technical support. However, the description of the data dashboard (e.g. interoperable data system) provides a solid example of efforts to increase data use.

# E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)** | 15 | 13 |

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does an excellent job in describing a thoroughly detailed continuous improvement process with an exhaustive list of examples regarding how data will be collected, summarized and utilized by stakeholders through the Data Dashboard. The applicant does not mention, in their plan, a process through which they will "publicly share information on the quality of its investments" as specified in the NIA. Also, their comprehensive plan for continuous improvement doesn't specify the parties responsible for establishing *iZone policy that defines expectations for staff participation in the continuous improvement process* (e.g. use the Data Dashboard). This particular aspect of the plan is perhaps the most important for success because if they go to great lengths to develop a versatile data dashboard, it won't do anything to facilitate improvement and success of this initiative unless every one of the 11 LEA's is using it as its intended.

| **(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)** | 5 | 4 |
|---|---|---|

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides convincing evidence of their ablity to communicate effectively across LEA's, mainly because these LEA's have been part of the same ILN in Kentucky for the past two years. They are already accustomed to communicating and engaging each other in dialogue related to reform so this project should fit well within their established model of networking. There is additional evidence of how parents and community members will be engaged through the partnership with PFSS (e.g. focus grps and community forums) and this will also be crucial to their success, especially with the larger-scale implementation plans asking parents and students to support rather substantial reforms in their schools. The applicant has given extensive consideration to the factors effecting communication and engagement and have proposed a plan with a high probability of keeping stakeholders engaged throughout the grant process.

| **(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)** | 5 | 2 |
|---|---|---|

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The information presented on performance measures is very fragmented. It is understandable that with 11 LEA's participating, with various numbers of schools and types of grade bands, the performance measures used might vary a bit. However, the proposal lacks specificity about the rationale behind selecting certain measures (e.g. PBIS) and the tables are blank in a few places making it unclear what the applicant may have intended to present here. (e.g. Graves - # of student referrals, Jessamine, Williamstown K-PREP for 4th/5th). Further, some LEA's appear to be using an average ACT/PLAN score and others use the % of students meeting the college-ready benchmarks established by ACT with no explicit discussion of the rationale behind the variation. Other confusing aspects include: Fayette County figures appear to be incorrect in their gr.4-8 table, showing 109.4% and 105.5% in the final year of the grant so this is also confusing; Kenton County only shows a 10th grade measure for one high school yet their implementation includes more schools and grade levels; some of the LEA's are also lacking a social-emotional leading indicator for grades 9-12, as specified in the NIA and some appear to be using their academic indicators as their career-readiness indicators as though these two are synonymous, which they are not.

| **(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)** | 5 | 1 |
|---|---|---|

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Elsewhere in the proposal, the applicant mentions how an external evaluator, along with researchers from UK, will utilize the Data Dashboard to evaluate project success and facilitate formative changes that may be necessary. However, there is no part of the narrative or appendices labeled E(4) so it is unclear whether the applicant may have intended to provide a more formal evaluation plan specifically responding to this section of the NIA (and inadvertently omitted it) or they will be relying solely on their plan for continuous improvement to facilitate the evaluation process.

# F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)** | 10 | 7 |

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides exhaustive list of funds used to support the project beyond RTTT funds and provides a thoughtful rationale for their investments.  Because there are some commonalities across the 11 LEA's, it is a credible approach to deduct the common costs first and then take the remaining funds and divide them among the participating LEA's. However, there is a vague rationale for why the applicant chose to take the remaining amount of funds and divide by the total number of students, resulting in a per student allocation for each district.  While this may seem "fair", it does not take into account the variability that exists among these LEA's in terms of their implementation. Some are only implementing reform in Math, some with an entire high school, some with only after-school community centers available two afternoons per week. It seems like a per student allocation may result in an abundance of funding in some districts and insufficient funds in others, particularly because in some cases the number of "participating students" reflects all those that will have access to a particular reform strategy but since the project hasn't begun, the schools don't yet know how many of those will actually utilize the reform strategy. (e.g. after-school support).  In addition some LEA's (e.g. Jessamine) provide an excellent rationale, supported with convincing evidence, in their itemized budget and are examples of well-planned reform strategies.

The amounts presented do seem reasonable and sufficient to support implementation, in _most_ cases, but a few inconsistencies exist. For example:

(1) Fayette budgets $40K/yr for parent engagement and $20K for food and the rationale for this isn't entirely clear.

(2) Graves proposes to hire a Reading Intervention Specialist and pay them $16,534 to work 35 hours/wk. This salary is not likely to attract a highly qualified candidate who can provide the intensive services specified here.  Graves also specifies only 2-4 days of additional prof'l development for their teachers which isn't likely to be sufficient given their reform approach specified.

(3) Kenton proposes to purchase 153 Smartboards and Document Camera without explicitly stating elsewhere in the proposal how this form of equipment will be necessary to implement their proposed reform.

(4) Knox County does not specify bus driver salaries in their personnel section, but includes bus driver fringe benefits in a subsequent section.  Further, in Section A, the applicant specifies Knox will serve only 150 students in Year 1 and their approach involves the launch of "community centers" at 10 school sites which are open _for several hours after school for two days per week._  However, the budget includes the purchase of 1,721 mobile learning devices in Year 1.  It is confusing how one section specifies 150 participating students in Section A(1) and then specifies over 2800 participating students in Section A(2) , and their performance measures in Section E do not specify a number of particpating students as indicated in the NIA template provided -- yet the budget purchases devices for 1,721 students in Year 1.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)** | 10 | 7 |

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides strong evidence of sustainability since none of the 11 LEA's are supporting their RTTT project solely with funds from this grant. Since they are already supplementing these reform ideas with other sources of funding, sustainability will be more feasible. However, one concern in the sustainability plan is the use of personal devices and the large amount of funding typically required for these types of reforms.  Specifically, the applicant states that 61.46% of the direct costs will be spent on internet-based technology tools and supporting infrastructure with the "overwhelming majority" of these (61%) funds "_allocated for the purchase of student and educator tablets or computers_".   With the rate of technological advances observed in the last 5-10 years, it is a virtual certainty that the devices purchased through this program will be somewhat outdated by the time the grant funds expire.  The cost of device upgrades and replacements is likely to be huge.  While the applicant does specify several sources of funding that will remain in place after the project ends, there is limited evidence these funds will be sufficient to maintain all of the equipment and infrastructure purchased through this grant.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)** | **10** | **4** |

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes the role of UK's P-20 Innovation Lab extensively throughout this proposal so the depth of that partnership is quite evident. However, the applicant mentions partnerships with a Family Resource Center and an Out-of-School Alliance as well. While details are provided about the services these organizations provided there is very limited evidence of how these organizations will partner with the LEA's in the proposal, whether they'll only partner with a subset of LEA's, or how the partnership will further the specific goals of the proposal. For example, the Family Resource Center typically serves students in PK-5th/6th grade and the majority of the participating students in this proposal are middle/high school age.

## Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **Absolute Priority 1** | **Met/Not Met** | **Met** |

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides substantial evidence of their ability to personalize learning across these 11 LEA's. Each LEA is considered both individually and collectively in terms of student needs and it is clear the applicant thoughtfully considered how to create a multi-LEA partnership throughout their state.

| **Total** | **210** | **132** |
|---|---|---|

# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

### Application #1402KY-2 for Fayette County Public Schools

## A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)** | **10** | **7** |

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant proposed to create personalized learning environments using an array of online and student grouping strategies. The applicant articulated how the proposed project builds on the applicant's current reform activities in the four core education assurance areas.

First, the applicant's residing state has adopted college-and-career ready standards, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and overhauled their statewide assessment system. This leads the reviewer to belive that the proposed learning model will address the college and career ready standards.

Second, the applicant stated that one of the key project activities will be developing a student performance tracking tool. This assures that the applicant will contiue building data system that measure student growth and inform instruction.

Third, the applicant stated that the project activity will create a vigorous cross district professional learning community. The cross district learning community is expected to develop effective educators.

Fourth, the applicant did not address their current effort to support lowest achieving schools. The consortium may not have lowest achieving schools but it was not clear in the narrative.

Overall, the applicant articulated a comprehensive and coherent vision to support creating personalized learning environments. It was clear and easy to understand what they are proposing and how the project addresses the four core educational assurance areas except regarding the lowest achieving schools. For this reason, a medium rage score is given to this section.

| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|---|---|---|

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant is a consortium of 11 school districts. The applicant described the process that was used to select schools. Each district developed their own approach to implementation of the project with varying priorities on grade levels (e.g., elementary vs. secondary, or all) and subjects (e.g., math, math and science, or Math, science and English).

The process ensured that the participating schools collectively meet the eligibility requirements (over 2,000 students, 40% or more of participating students are from low income families). The project will involve 26,730 students in each of the four project years and the percentage of high needs students is over 40%.

The table included the list of participating schools in each participating district, grades, the total number of participating students, the number of participating students from low-income families, the number of participating students who are high-need students, and the number of participating teachers in each school.

This section was complete and deserves a high score.

| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|---|---|---|

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's plan describing how the project will be scaled up beyond the participating schools was logical and clear. The applicant explained that the project will first impact other schools in each district, then will be scaled up to impact all districts in the consortium, then the impact will be extended to the rest of the state.

Activities to support this scale-up were identified, including a presentation at the state meeting. Persons, and organizations who will be involved in the activity were also identified, including teachers and leaders, the Board of Education, the Association of School Administration etc... However, the deliverables and timeline were not clear.

Other LEA-wide activity to support the vision of personalized learning, deeper engagement in learning, and competency based learning progression was identified. It included biweekly conference calls, and leadership academy cohort. Persons who will be involved in the activity were clearly described with a timeline. Topics identified in the discussions to support the vision could be the deliverables of the activities.

The description of the applicant's plan for scaling up and the supporting activities was clear and reasonable. It was easy to understand how the project outcomes will be shared and impact other schools in the consortium and the state. However, some essential components (e.g., timeline, deliverables) of a high-quality plan were not explicit in the narrative. Therefore, a medium range score is given to this section.

| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
|---|---|---|

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The goals presented by the applicant shows an increase in student achievement on summative assessments and decreased gaps between student subgroups over the grant period. However, the goals were not set for the whole district but only for the participating grades in the district (e.g., Barren county - 5,6,8, and 9th grades; Boone county- 6,7, and 8th grades).

Also, except Barren county, it was not clear if the set annual goals were equal to or exceed the State ESEA targets.

Student sub-groups were not defined consistently across the participating schools. For example, in Fayette county, student subgroups were defined by the school that the students belong to. In other counties, student subgroups were defined by free/reduced price lunch eligibility, special education eligibility, English proficiency, and race.

Presented graduation rates and college enrollment rates were not adequate. In some cases, the targets for student subgroups were not set (e.g, Eminence Independent Schools, Knox county) and the annual targets were left blank (e.g., Barren and Knox counties).

For these reasons, a low medium range score is given to this section.

# B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)** | 15 | 4 |

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The proposed project is a multi-district collaboration that involves 11 school districts. It is understandable that not all 11 districts can provide a stellar record of success in areas, (a) to (d) as described in the notice. All districts provided a prior record of success in the appendices and it contained many meaningful outcomes including increased student achievement on state standardized assessments, improvement in schools that were failing to meet AYP in the past years (Eminence Independent Schools), increased college and career readiness, and number of students who are taking Advanced Placement Courses.

However, in almost all cases, improved outcomes were not evidenced by data from the past four years and closing achievement gaps was not sufficiently described using student subgroup data.

Also, the district's ability to make student performance data available to students, educators and parents were not addressed at all.

For these reasons, a low medium range score is given to this section.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)** | 5 | 2 |

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant described the historical background (lawsuit) that drove the state-level transparency requirement for school budgets. To some degree, the state measures explained the extent to which the applicant reports the school-level expenditures to the public (e.g, public access to district financial information, school employee salary published in local newspapers). However, the narrative did not comprehensively address the categories (a)- (d) as described in the notice. It was not clear what types of school level expenditures (e.g., personnel and non-personnel) are included in the school finance report and how the employee salaries that are published in local newspapers are categorized (e.g., instructional vs. non-instructional support). For this reason, a medium range score is given to this section.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)** | 10 | 9 |

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant described both successful conditions and sufficient school level autonomy to successfully implement the proposed project. Successful conditions were described, including the state level initiatives related to the development of a robust data system and teacher development. In addition to this support, schools will have autonomy over factors, such as staff and resource alignment, and professional development. The applicant stated that the school autonomy will be used explicitly to support the proposed project and documented this in the participating schools' annual plans. The applicant provided sufficient information that demonstrates successful conditions and school autonomy and articulated how the state level support and school autonomy will be linked to support the project. Therefore a high range score is given to this section.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)** | 10 | 7 |

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

All participating school districts in the consortium provided evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposal from teachers. For most districts, the signature of the teacher's union representative was provided. For the district (Eminence) that did not submit the signature of the teacher's union representative, evidence (teacher survey results) that over 70% of teachers from the participating schools support the proposal was included in the appendices. Letters of support from key stakeholders, including the business community, parent organizations, students, and individual teachers and parents were included as

evidence of stakeholder engagement and support.  Although the supporting evidence for stakeholder support and engagement was sufficient, the description of how students, parents and teachers were informed of this competition and invited to provide input was lacking. Therefore, a medium range score is given to this section.

| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant proposed the development of "personalized learning dashboard" software as the tool for needs and gap analysis. While student performance data provides rich information about the gaps and needs of individual students toward the college and career ready standards and personalized learning, it can be only one component of the needs and gap analysis in the bigger scheme of the project implementation.  Successful implementation of the proposed project will require an analysis of  school and district level factors, such as teacher needs, instructional resources, curriculum, district leadership and collaboration with other participating districts, and parent involvement. Therefore, the needs and gap analysis for the project implementation was too narrowly defined. Also, a high quality plan that defines activities, timelines, responsible parties and deliverables for the goal was not presented. Therefore a medium low range score is given to this section.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(C)(1) Learning (20 points)** | 20 | 14 |

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant described the project's approach to personalized learning for all students.

Student owned/driven learning was emphasized in the narrative. Students are supposed to engage in goal setting, and monitoring of their learning. This is a sound approach to help students understand the importance of their own learning, measure their own progress, and structure their own learning. -(a)(i), (ii)

A personalized learning sequence (b)(i), critical skills development and mastery of content (a)(v) that leads to deep learning experiences (a)(iii) were addressed as well. The applicant described how the application of mastered knowledge will look like in project based learning. Learning on their own pace was supported by the student statement.  Students will also have opportunities to appreciate diversity (a)(iv) and develop essential skills that are required in 21st century society through a variety activities, such as project-based learning and student-led conferences.

Parents and educators' supporting roles in the proposed personalized learning environments were described. Parents and educators will be able to review student progress using the dashboard and provide feedback to students (b)(iv). The applicant addressed how students will be taught to manage their learning logs (c) to track their progress.

The applicant described how the consortium will ensure that students will have access to a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and contents on and off school sites. - (B)(ii), (iii). The use of blended learning strategies, and the availability of an online database that provides resources on effective teaching and learning are the supporting evidence.

Overall, the applicant successfully described their approaches to subcategories (a) to (c). However, a high -quality plan that summarizes the goal areas, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties was missing in the narrative. For this reason, a medium range score is given to this section.

| **(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)** | 20 | 14 |
|---|---|---|

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant described multiple resources to demonstrate the consortiums's approach to teaching and leading.

Each instructional unit created for the project will be linked to common core state standards and assessments to ensure that the consortium implements strategies that meet the college and career ready standards - (a)(i).

Multiple blended learning strategies were proposed using podcast, webcast, and grouping strategies. This will ensure that students will have customized instruction based on their needs - (a)(ii). The online learning strategies are also a clever way to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective educators -(d). Master teachers instruction can be accessed across districts through the online technology.  Effective instruction can be shared between

educators through the web and provide high quality professional learning resources - (b)(ii).

Four questions that frame unit development and instructional approaches were described. The questions (e.g., what topics are worth understanding? , What interventions will be in place? ) yields actionable information that helps educators to improve their instruction -(b)(i).

The LEA's teacher evaluation system was described in detail. The system will provide feedback on teacher effectiveness in terms of student growth, professional growth, peer observation, self-reflection, classroom observation and student voice - (a)(iv), (c)(i).

To continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps - (b)(iii),(C)(ii), the applicant reported that the consortium has developed frameworks of teacher/leader effectiveness.

Students e-portfolios were described in this section again as a tool to frequently measure student progress towards meeting college and career ready standards (a)(iii).

Overall, the applicant approaches to effective teaching leading were sufficiently described using supporting evidence mentioned above. However, a high-quality plan that summarizes the goal areas, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible partiess was lacking. Therefore, a medium range score is given to this section.

# D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)** | 15 | 5 |

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

It was clear that the applicant has developed the consortium governance structure to efficiently support all participating schools. The applicant described the consortium level committee including the roles and responsibilities of the committee, the representative of the committee, frequency of the committee meetings, and the consortium-wide data to be discussed by the committee. The district level subcommittees and the consortium level committee's role was described as supporting schools by ensuring that participating schools have sufficient autonomy and flexibility to successfully implement the project.

The consortium level committee will also ensure that the project activities will be implemented in a way that students with disabilities and English Language challenges will have equal access to learning resources. However, the applicant did not provide sufficient information on how the committee will approach this concern.

Opportunities for students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, multiple times and ways were not explicitly addressed in this section.

Lastly, a high-quality plan that delineates goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, and responsible parties was not provided.

For these reasons, a medium range score is given to this section.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)** | 10 | 2 |

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The LEA and school infrastructure described by the applicant focused solely on the governance mechanism. The consortium and district level support to each school site and school site's improvement plan to support the implementation of the proposed project was explained. Therefore, the applicant failed to address the subcategories, (a) to (d) of this criterion. No information about technical support for stakeholders, including parents, students, and their data systems was provided. Therefore, a low range score is given to this section.

# E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)** | 15 | 10 |

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant proposed a rigorous continuous improvement process that is informed by a variety of data. Student dashboard

and management dashboard were described as a way to collect data related to student progress and project effectiveness. A variety of measures were identified, including learning plan content (e.g., curriculum, assessments, lesson plans), methods of instructional delivery, student academic and behavioral growth measures, and surveys. Educators will be trained on how to interpret the data and use it to enhance their instruction. Research and technology experts will be hired to improve the ongoing progress monitoring.

The methods for progress monitoring and the measures were described with sufficient details as summarized above. However, it was not clear how the information yielded from the evaluation will be shared publicly. For this reason, a medium range score is given to this section.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)** | 5 | 4 |

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Strategies for ongoing communication included forums for the internal stakeholders, such as the participating district leaders. The applicant also prosed to broadcast personalized learning activities to inform internal and external stakeholders. Community forums and discussions were suggested to engage parents, business leaders and other external stakeholders. These strategies are considered reasonable ways to engage various stakeholders. Therefore, a high score is given to this section.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)** | 5 | 2 |

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

A number of performance measures (a through q) were proposed by the applicant for all 11 participating districts. Districts differed in the grade bands that they are targeting during the project activities. Therefore, each district proposed a different set of performance measures.

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup who were taught by highly effective or effective teachers were required as a performance measure for all participating students regardless of their grade level. These measures were not included for any of the participating district.

For grades 4-8, a college and career ready indicator, academic indicator (e,g,Measure of Academic Progress) and social-emotional indicator (e.g, number of office referrals, social/emotional assessment) were all included. However, in some cases, the target goals were left blank with no sufficient explanations (e.g., Williamstown independent schools, Jessamine County). Student subgroups were not defined correctly in some cases (e.g, Fayette county- subgroups were defined by school building).

For grades 9-12, the number and percentage of students who participate in the FAFSA program, college -and -career readiness, career readiness, academic (e.g., Math proficiency, Measure of Academic Progress), and social-emotional indicators (e.g., attendance, number of office referrals) were all included as performance measures. However, the annual targets were not specified in some cases (e.g., Fayette county- FAFSA, Jessamine county, Williamstown) and student subgroups were not consistently addressed across participating schools.

The rationale for the selection of the measures, plans to review and improve the measures were not provided in the narrative. Therefore a low medium range score is given to this section.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)** | 5 | 1 |

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Several ways to evaluate the project effectiveness were mentioned in previous sections, including the use of the student dashboard, management dashboard, external evaluators, and the teacher evaluation system. However, they were not explained in more detail in this section. Section (E)(4) was visibly missing in the application. There was no explanation about why it was missing. Therefore a low range score is given to this section.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)** | 10 | 7 |

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identified all funds that will support the project, including the district's general fund budgets, state education

technology funds, Title I, Title II and other discretionary grants such as GEAR UP and Investing in Innovations. The applicant stated that 88% of the direct costs of grant funds will be used for one-time investments and for building educator capacity. This strategy will ensure the long-term sustainability of the project. Purchases of student and educator tablets or computers were identified as the one-time investments.

A budget table was prepared for each of the 11 participating district. All districts provided itemized costs for personnel, fringe, contractual; supplies, travel and equipment. In most cases, descriptions for each category of the budget were reasonable and sufficient to support the project activities (e.g., parent/community involvement cost, office supplies, devices for technology classrooms, etc). Some districts did not provide sufficient information for cost assumptions (e.g., Fayette county, and Trigg county did not provide itemized Fringe benefit).

Overall, sufficient information was provided for the budget justification. However, the level of details (itemization) provided in the budget table differed across districts. Therefore, a medium range score is given to this section.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)** | 10 | 3 |

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Sources of financial support has been identified to sustain the project after the RTTD grant term (e.g, district, and technology funds). Also, the applicant identified factors (e.g., faculty capacity building) that will contribute to the sustainability of the project. However, a high quality plan that describes activities to ensure the sustainability of the project, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties is not present. Therefore a low-medium range score is given to this section.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)** | 10 | 5 |

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

A description of sustainable and coherent partnerships with three organizations (Family Resource Center, Out-of-School Alliance, and P20 Innovation Lab) was provided. It was clear what services the partner organizations provides for participating students and how their services (e.g., social services, before/after school programs, summer program, and dissemination of evidence based practice) support personalized learning.

Partnership goals were identified. Goals only included educational outcomes (math, reading, college and career readiness). Important family and community support outcomes were not identified.

The applicant promised that the outcome indicators will be tracked and monitored using the proposed student dashboard. Since the partnership goals focus on the results for high-needs students, it is expected that the services that are available through the partnership can be concentrated on this student population. It was not clear how the applicant will improve the partnership results over time.

Approaches to staff capacity building in the participating schools were not provided in the narrative. Although the dashboard may provide the educators a tool to assess the needs of high needs students, it was not clear what other staff capacity building might be in place through the partnership.

Annual goals were not set. Overall partnership goals were set for the whole project period.

For the above reasons, a medium range score is given to this section.

## Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **Absolute Priority 1** | Met/Not Met | Met |

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The blended learning model proposed by the applicant supports creating personalized learning environments.

It was evidenced in the proposed district-wide goals and performance measures and the consortium's approaches to learning, teaching and leading. Improved achievement in core academic subject areas, graduation and college enrollment rates, and college and career readiness were included as the consortium wide goals.

The applicant's approach to achieve the goals were described in the four core educational assurance areas.

The applicant made it clear in the narrative that the proposed learning model will align with the newly adopted college and career ready standards, the Common Core State standards.

The applicant proposed to build a student performance tracking tool, student dashboard. This will strengthen their data system and better inform instruction.

The applicant stated that the project activity will create a vigorous cross district professional learning community. The cross district learning community is expected to develop effective educators.

Although it was not clear whether the lowest performing schools are included among participating schools, the project activities (e.g., data system, professional learning community) are considered as innovative and promising to support weak schools.

Overall, the applicant articulated a comprehensive and coherent vision. It was clear and easy to understand what they are proposing to do and how the project addresses the four core educational assurance areas. Therefore, it is concluded that the application met the absolute priority 1.

| Total | 210 | 117 |
|---|---|---|

# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

### Application #1402KY-3 for Fayette County Public Schools

## A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)** | 10 | 5 |

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identifies many initiatives that are underway including Innovation Lab Network, Kentucky Consortium for Personalized Learning and collaboration with University of Kentucky P20 Innovation Laboratory but does not articulate results of these initiatives. The Applicant provides the general idea of establishing Technology "hotspots" and "Dashboards" which will allow for increased access to technology for students and monitoring of student progress. The proposal is lacking specific actions related to the implementation of the general vision. There are several ares of concern: The applicant states Kentucky is in the process of of adopting new teacher/principal and superintendent evaluation tools,building a state longitudinal Data system and a state portal for educational resources. These initiatives take considerable resources such as time and personnel to implement effectively. With this level of reform before the applicant it is difficult to merge the implementation of this proposal with systems that have yet to be designed or identified.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)** | 10 | 5 |

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has provided a description of all schools and a general outline of the make up of students who will be participating. The Kenton County public school (Ft. Wright) had no information related to participating students in the narrative. The charts provided did give specific information required in this section including listing participating schools, incomplete

listing of number of students participating and low-income student participating. The applicant has provided an overly general description of the participating schools and in one instance simply provide the location of the district.

The applicant provided an general outline of participating schools however there is insufficient information to identify the total participating student population.

| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|---|---|

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes the scale up model as a continued collaboration effort with the Innovation Lab Network (ILN) initiative. While providing a broad summary of the goal of the ILN the applicant does not identify specifics of their involvement in this network. There is no discussion related to policy or regulatory changes which would enhance the effort to institutionalize the reform effort. The applicant described various organizations such as the State Superintendents Association, State Board of Education and State Association of School Administrators.

| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|---|---|

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provided a detailed description of the revised State assessment system and the components which are included in the system Achievement, Gap, Growth in reading and math, College/Career-Readiness Rate and Graduation Rate. Many charts were provided for all of the various participating with targets for student achievement. The concern is with the lack of any explanation of the referred charts and no indication of a collaborative effort of the participating LEA's to use a common or standard method of identifying and/or projecting future student growth and achievement. It appears that each school or district simply submitted their information in isolation form one another.

The information provided by the applicant was segmented and there is no evidence of a collaborative approach to using data to monitor student outcomes for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of this proposal. It appears that this is a group of school districts working in isolation who are submitting individual data for the purpose of participating in this application.

# B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)** | 15 | 10 |

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides in general, anecdotal records of programs and individual school improvement, however there is a lack of any information within the consortium that there demonstrates an increase in student achievement. There are exciting reform efforts described in this narrative such as the Innovation Lab Networks and iZone implementation, but a lack of specificity related to program content, implementation and student outcomes. It appears that while there are many reform efforts happening there is no structure within the consortium to monitor and evaluate the impact of these efforts.

| **(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)** | 5 | 3 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes in detail the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1991 reform efforts and all laws and requirements inclusive of the creation of standardized school budgeting, Statewide budget reporting system and publishing of school and district-wide report cards, related to open disclosure of financial and policy related matters including salaries of personnel . The applicant referred to the establishment of School Based Decision Making Councils and their roles in providing a system of transparency. There is no reference to a system-wide effort to publish this initiative, the impact of this effort on student achievement or use of current technology such as existing websites in an effort to provide public education related to this proposal.

The reporting requirements as stated above are standard and in the instance of a standardized school budgeting system, established in 1991 a concern in that this was not in place prior to this law.

| **(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)** | 10 | 5 |
|---|---|---|

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes in detail the efforts, inclusive of linking student achievement data to Teacher effectiveness, undertaken at the State level to reform public education inclusive of the P20 data collaborative. This collaborative links together data from from early childhood, K-12 and post-secondary education providing the ability to develop a broader understanding of the educational process and the impact of that continuum on student success. This is a laudable effort but the applicant does not describe the autonomy provided by these reforms rather they describe in detail the regulatory requirements that are in place as part of the reform effort.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)** | **10** | **5** |

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provided the necessary documentation of support as required in this section. In the narrative it was unclear about the level of meaningful engagement as the applicant simply identified the school structure as the means of the engagement. There was no consistent approach to soliciting various stakeholder input an in fact at one point the applicant states "in some cases decisions have involved planning primarily by the central office staff and principals with teachers simply agreeing to proposals offered by administrators".  This is indicative of a low level of collaboration and often results with little ownership or buy-in on the part of those who were not part of the decision making process.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)** | **5** | **3** |

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant acknowledges the difficulty of of creating a rigorous, system-wide needs and gap analysis process incisive of each iZone. This acknowledgement has caused the applicant to rely on the development and implementation of a Personalized Learning Dashboard. This process will focus on the the gathering of data from various State and local networks. This data will then be used to monitor student progress as related to meeting new standards. The plan narrative does not describe the details of this process.

# C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(C)(1) Learning (20 points)** | **20** | **15** |

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identifies a plethora of strategies inclusive of  the development of iZones and use of data dashboards, that students will incorporate as they develop and progress through their Individual Learning Plans. Of interest is the fact that students will take more of an active role in the development and evaluation of their plan as well as the level of their academic achievement. This is an excellent concept but there are no details as to how students would be prepared to implement this part of the proposal.  The applicant does not address the role of the student in evaluating their own progress such as, planing their future, individual freedom in selection of course of study and alike. Conceptually this a a very exciting plan however the lack of critical details related to plan implementation leaves this portion of the proposal incomplete.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)** | **20** | **10** |

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identifies general application of various strategies but specifics are again lacking. An example of this is "Each hotspot will develop flexible blended learning model that will enable every student to have access to a highly qualified teacher inside and outside of the school day....this will be available to students in many different ways". the applicant then identifies several different strategies all technology based...iTunes University, Podcasting, webcasts and alike. What about the student who has limited access to technology whether through lack of device availability or connectivity. Additionally, the applicant generally describes the development of e-Portfolios beginning in grade 9 to be presented to a panel of decision makers to determine whether High School Graduation and College and career readiness standards have been met. There is no identification of the membership of this panel, process of evaluation, description of evaluation rubric. The lack of specificity of theses critical components proposal incomplete.

# D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)** | 15 | 10 |

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes a traditional top-down management structure for ensuring Practices, Policies and rules are in place. Beginning with the Superintendent's Advisory Council who will be responsible for consortium goal areas, setting the pace of the work, ensuring commonality of the work and protecting the fidelity of the work. Next the plan relies on the program director will be responsible for for organization of staff meeting a reporting dashboard driven progress reports to the Council. The SAC and program manager participants across the LEAs will determine if additional committees, work groups, or task force needs to be established.

With a proposal this large and including 11 School Districts, serving over 26,000 students and more than 1000 teachers there needs to be a more definded paln of implementation including a quality evaluation plan.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)** | 10 | 5 |

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant relies on traditional structures inclusive of school based decision making teams in conjunction with Superintendent Advisory Council to advise on plan implementation, policy adjustments, monitor student performance data and program reviews. Again the applicant provides a general overview of monitoring policies and supporting infrastructure but does not provide critical specifics needed to develop a comprehensive implementing of the proposal. There is no identification of membership of these teams which levels the question of the level and quality of stakeholder involvement.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)** | 15 | 10 |

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

In this area the applicant does provide specifics related the development and use of the data dashboard as a means of monitoring program implementation and the needs of program development over time. The issue of concern is there is no timeline for development of the dashboard nor are there specifics of what the dashboard will include. The statement "We will develop the dashboard collaboratively.....to establish a user-friendly information system that brings together data from diverse resources to inform next steps.". The applicant does not identify the data that will be used to evaluate progress and allow for future planning. If one does not identify the pertinent data needed to evaluate a plan then how effective will the evaluation be? The plan needs to be more fully developed inclusive of the evaluation process identifying data which will be used to evaluate plan effectiveness.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)** | 5 | 3 |

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant clearly identifies the Partnership for Successful Schools including the use of the Innovation Lab Networks and the partnership with Georgetown College and  as the external stakeholders which the consortium will collaborate with as a means of providing input related to continuous plan improvement. While the applicant describes the support from this collaboration promotion of Kentucky Scholars program...an initiative to encourage students to enroll in college preparatory curriculum. Internally the applicant identifies the Innovation lab network as the primary source of ongoing communication. The applicant does not describe any structure or format for the communication to be monitored and/or evaluated.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)** | 5 | 3 |

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides a comprehensive series of charts indicating performance measures for all students including sub-groups. The charts include: number of participating students by County who are on track to college and career readiness as well as targets for increasing those student numbers for successive years. Additional charts provided are related to student

success as measured by student achievement on the State assessment. There is no explanation of how these measures were selected, rational for the use of these measures and no plan for reviewing the selection of these measures should they be insufficient to gage the implementation progress.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)** | **5** | **1** |

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant did identify the use of an external evaluator and a collaborative effort with the University of Kentucky in other sections of this application There is no description of program effectiveness related to investments identified or described in this section.

The applicant did not provide details related to the expectations of the external evaluator other than to identify a collaborative relationship with the University of Kentucky

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)** | **10** | **10** |

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

This is the most complete section of the application. The applicant has identified associated funding of this program, clearly defined expenditures and a process for monitoring and tracking those expenditures. The need for project administration is stated as well as responsibilities associated with this role. The program implementation and related expenditures will be monitored and approved by the project administrator. The identification of one time expenditures for WiFi infrastructure and the development of WiFi on buses is also delineated There is funding the Superintendent's Advisory Council which appears redundant. Administrative oversight is the responsibility of the Superintendents.

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)** | **10** | **7** |

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identifies the ability to sustain the program through State initiatives such as the Innovation Lab Network. Additionally, the Consortium commits to using local and State funds as well as formula and discretionary funds. The applicant is right to point out that the professional development that will be part of this program will be a strong component of the sustainability. In theses extremely financially challenging times for public education an area of concen is the reliance on State and formula funding.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)** | **10** | **0** |

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

Nothing submitted

## Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---|---|---|
| **Absolute Priority 1** | **Met/Not Met** | **Met** |

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has identified the vision and development of personalized learning environments through the implementation of a system of Innovation Lab Networks. The applicant further plans to expand this vision through the development of iZones and

Hotspots. These strategies will focus on establishing sustainable continuous improvement zones, development of learning dashboards and implement training programs which will provide expertise in the use of the data dashboards to support continuous improvement.

| Total | 210 | 120 |
| --- | --- | --- |